

After 30 years of faithful service to our country, Slim retired. But this did not slow him down. Slim took a job with the Bureau of Reclamation in their cloud seeding program. Later, Slim worked for the Department of Atmospheric Science at Colorado State University. Slim spent 15 years in that department as a manager, researcher and also a teacher.

In addition to service to family and service to our country, Slim also strongly believes in service to God. Slim and Mary attend Saint Joseph's Catholic Church in Fort Collins, Colorado. There, Slim serves as a lector and a communion minister.

Slim has been truly blessed with a great career and a great family. I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Somervell. May God continue to bless the Somervells for years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO MAE CATHERINE GREENE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Mae Catherine Greene in recognition for her dedication to her community.

Mae Catherine Greene fondly known as "Cat" by family and close friends is almost a life long resident of the east New York community of which she has been an integral and staunchly loyal advocate. She was born in Chadbourn, NC in March of 1957, the ninth of ten children of a proud and independent working mother.

Mae obtained her education in the neighborhood she so greatly loves and admires. She attended P.S. 149, I.S. 292 and William H. Maxwell High School in east New York. Mae, who has been married for almost 27 years to her childhood sweetheart, Richard Greene, is the proud mother of six children who still live in east New York as well.

Having six children in the public school system and being a concerned, loving and dedicated parent, Mae took a strong interest in the neighborhood's public school system. She was very involved and an active presence in many different capacities. She served as President and Secretary on Community Board 19 and President of the P.T.A. at P.S. 213, I.S. 171 and I.S. 292. Additionally, she was Chapter 1 Chairperson for the District for both P.S. 213 and I.S. 171 as well as P.A.C. President for the Board for two day care centers, Georgia-Livonia and Einstein in East NY.

Mae is not only an advocate for education, but she is also very involved in community and politically based issues and activities. She has been a longtime advocate for senior citizen, immigrant and housing rights. Mae has served as Secretary to the Tenants' Advisory Board and Property Manager at Elva McZeal Housing Development and as a Community Advisor at Beekman Houses in the Bronx, NY. She also set up a parents' rights advocacy for immigrant parents at P.S. 213, was a community liaison for Health Plus, and an advocate for the senior citizens at Elva McZeal Houses.

Mr. Speaker, Mae Catherine Greene has strengthened her community through her nu-

merous volunteer efforts with the PTA, the Community Board, and local housing associations. As such, she is more than worthy of receiving our recognition today and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring this truly remarkable person.

HONORING MSGT ROBERT F. GREEN, JR.

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of MSGT Robert F. Green. Master Sergeant Green, a resident of Ontario, New York is retiring from the United States Air Force after years of dedicated service.

His retirement allows for reflection on what can only be considered a sterling career. He has admirably served his country without question or reservation. His fellow soldiers will attest that Master Sergeant Green sets the standard regarding attributes such as honor, respect, duty and country.

On behalf of my colleagues, and myself, I extend my gratitude, great appreciation and well wishes for prosperous retirement years. Thank you for your service to our country.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MRS. ANNE DORA MOORE HALL

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, today I would like honor the life of Mrs. Anne Dora Moore Hall, 4 passed away on March 16, 2005. Mrs. Hall was born in Cherokee County, Texas to Miles Cleveland and Madge Edwards Moore. She lived most of her life in Dallas and had a long, successful career as an insurance executive.

A mother to two children, Robert and Steven, and wife to Bergen Hall, Mrs. Hall was also very active in her community. She was an officer in the Pierce Brooks Gospel Foundation, served on the Texas Safety Council, and worked with the Crippled Children's Foundation of America. She was also engaged in politics as a longtime member of the White Rock Women's Republican Club, the Public Affairs Luncheon Club, and working at her local precinct during elections.

As a mother, a wife, a businesswoman, and a community leader, Mrs. Anne Dora Moore Hall's life has embodied the values of family, community, and hard work that lie at the core of American society. As her representative in Congress, it is my distinct pleasure to honor her today on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

JEFF JACOBY SHOWS INTEGRITY ON TORTURE ISSUE

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest aspects of our current political dialogue is that partisanship has extended into the intellectual sphere. That is, I very much agree that people should pick one party or the other as being more representative of their views than the alternative and generally support that party. That is legitimate partisanship. Excessive partisanship comes when people are never willing to admit that "their side" ever makes mistakes, or that the "other side" ever has any virtues.

It is for this reason, as well as the substance of his well-reasoned articles, that I was very gratified to read Boston Globe Columnist Jeff Jacoby's two-part series on torture. Mr. Jacoby is a strong, outspoken conservative who supports the war in Iraq. But unlike many, he does not let his general ideological position in this set of issues make him an apologist for specific actions which go counter to the very moral values that the war in Iraq is supposed to be vindicating.

In a forceful two-part series in the Boston Globe, Mr. Jacoby makes a principled, thoughtful, fact-based case against the use of torture by Americans, even in the service of our entirely justified fight against terrorism.

Mr. Jacoby puts it eloquently in his first article: "Better intelligence means more lives saved, more atrocities prevented and a more likely victory in the war against radical Islamist fascism. Those are crucial ends and they justify tough means. But they don't justify means that betray core American values. Interrogation techniques that flirt with torture, to say nothing of those that end in death, cross the moral line that separates us from the enemy we are trying to defeat."

In his second article, Mr. Jacoby argues that the case against torture is not only a moral one but also a pragmatic one, noting, among other things, "torture is never limited to just the guilty."

Mr. Speaker, I salute Jeff Jacoby both for the force of his arguments and for the intellectual integrity he has shown in making them. No issue confronting our Nation is more important than how we deal with this set of questions and I therefore ask that Mr. Jacoby's very significant contribution be printed here.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 2005]

WHERE'S THE OUTRAGE ON TORTURE?

(By Jeff Jacoby)

In August 2003, when he was commander of the military base at Guantanamo Bay, Major General Geoffrey Miller visited Baghdad with some advice for US interrogators at Abu Ghraib prison. As Brigadier General Janis Karpinski, the military police commander in Iraq, later recalled it, Miller's bottom line was blunt: Abu Ghraib should be "Gitmo-ized." Iraqi detainees should be exposed to the same aggressive techniques being used to extract information from prisoners in Guantanamo.

"You have to have full control," Karpinski quoted Miller as saying. There can be "no

mistake about who's in charge. You have to treat these detainees like dogs."

Whether or not Miller actually spoke those words, it is clear that harsh techniques authorized for a time in Guantanamo forced nudity, hooding, shackling men in "stress positions," the use of dogs were taken up in Afghanistan and Iraq, where they sometimes degenerated into outright viciousness and even torture. Did the injunction to "treat these detainees like dogs" give rise to a prison culture that winked at barbarism? Should Miller be held responsible for what Abu Ghraib became?

The latest Pentagon report on the abuse of captives, delivered to Congress last week by Vice Admiral Albert Church III, doesn't point a finger of blame at Miller or any other high-ranking official. It concludes that while detainees in Iraq, Guantanamo, and elsewhere were brutalized by military or CIA interrogators, there was no formal policy authorizing such abuse. (On occasion it was even condemned in December 2002, for example, some Navy officials denounced the Guantanamo techniques as "unlawful and unworthy of the military services.")

But surely, Church was asked at a congressional hearing, someone should be held accountable for the scores of abuses that even the government admits to? "Not in my character," the admiral replied.

So the buck stops nowhere. And fresh revelations of horror keep seeping out.

Afghanistan, 2002: A detainee in the "Salt Pit" a secret, CIA-funded prison north of Kabul is stripped naked, dragged across a concrete floor, then chained in a cell and left overnight. By morning, he has frozen to death. According to The Washington Post, which sourced the story to four US government officials, the dead man was buried in an unmarked grave, and his family was never notified. What had the Afghan done to merit such lethal handling? "He was probably associated with people who were associated with Al Qaeda," a US official told the Post.

Iraq, 2003: Manadel al-Jamadi, arrested after a terrorist bombing in Baghdad, is brought in handcuffs to a shower room in Abu Ghraib. Shackles are connected from his cuffs to a barred window, hoisting his arms painfully behind his back a position so unnatural.

Sergeant Jeffrey Frost later tells investigators, that he is surprised the man's arms "didn't pop out of their sockets." Frost and other guards are summoned when an interrogator complains that al-Jamadi isn't cooperating. They find him slumped forward, motionless. When they remove the chains and attempt to stand him on his feet, blood gushes from his mouth. His ribs are broken. He is dead.

Then there is the government's use of "extraordinary rendition," a euphemism for sending terror suspects to be interrogated by other countries including some where respect for human rights is nonexistent and interrogation can involve beatings, electric shock, and other torture. The CIA says it always gets an assurance in advance that a prisoner will be treated humanely. But of what value are such assurances when they come from places like Syria and Saudi Arabia?

Of course the United States must hunt down terrorists and find out what they know. Better intelligence means more lives saved, more atrocities prevented, and a more likely victory in the war against radical Islamist fascism. Those are crucial ends, and they justify tough means. But they don't justify means that betray core American val-

ues. Interrogation techniques that flirt with torture to say nothing of those that end in death cross the moral line that separates us from the enemy we are trying to defeat.

The Bush administration and the military insist that any abuse of detainees is a violation of policy and that abusers are being punished. If so, why does it refuse to allow a genuinely independent commission to investigate without fear or favor? Why do Republican leaders on Capitol Hill refuse to launch a proper congressional investigation? And why do my fellow conservatives—those who support the war for all the right reasons—continue to keep silent about a scandal that should have them up in arms?

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Mar. 20, 2005]

Why Not Torture Terrorists?

(By Jeff Jacoby)

(Second of two columns)

The Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which the United States ratified in 1994, prohibits the torture of any person for any reason by any government at any time. It states explicitly that torture is never justified—"no exceptional circumstances whatsoever . . . may be invoked as a justification for torture." Unlike the Geneva Convention, which protects legitimate prisoners of war, the Convention Against Torture applies to everyone—even terrorists and enemy combatants. And it cannot be evaded by "outsourcing" a prisoner to a country where he is apt to be tortured during interrogation.

In short, the international ban on torture—a ban incorporated into US law—is absolute. And before Sept. 11, 2001, few Americans would have argued that it should be anything else.

But in post-9/11 America, the unthinkable is not only being thought, but openly considered. And not only by hawks on the right, but by even by critics in the center and on the left.

"In this autumn of anger," Jonathan Alter commented in Newsweek not long after the terrorist attacks, "a liberal can find his thoughts turning to—torture." Maybe cattle prods and rubber hoses should remain off limits, he wrote, but "some torture clearly works," and Americans had to "keep an open mind" about using unconventional measures—including "transferring some suspects to our less squeamish allies."

In March 2003, a few days after arch-terrorist Khalid Sheikh Mohammed was captured in Pakistan, Stuart Taylor Jr. acknowledged that he was probably being made to feel some pain. "And if that's the best chance of making him talk, it's OK by me," he wrote in his National Journal column. In principle, interrogators should not cross the line into outright torture. But, Taylor continued, "my answer might be different in extreme circumstances."

By "extreme circumstances" he meant what is often called the "ticking-bomb" scenario: A deadly terror attack is looming, and you can prevent it only by getting the information your prisoner refuses to divulge. Torture might force him to talk, thereby saving thousands of innocent lives. May he be tortured?

Many Americans would say yes without hesitating. Some would argue that torturing a terrorist is not nearly as wrong as refusing to do so and thereby allowing another 9/11 to occur. Others would insist that monsters of Mohammed's ilk deserve no decency.

As an indignant reader (one of many) wrote to me after last week's column on the

cruel abuse of some U.S. detainees, "The terrorists . . . would cut your heart out and stuff it into the throat they would proudly slash open." So why not torture detainees, if it will produce the information we need?

Here's why:

First, because torture, as noted, is unambiguously illegal—illegal under a covenant the United States ratified, illegal under Federal law, and illegal under protocols of civilization dating back to the Magna Carta.

Second, because torture is notoriously unreliable. Many people will say anything to make the pain stop, while some will refuse to yield no matter what is done to them. Yes, sometimes torture produces vital information. But it can also produce false leads and desperate fictions. In the ticking-bomb case, bad information is every bit as deadly as no information.

Third, because torture is never limited to just the guilty. The case for razors and electric shock rests on the premise that the prisoner is a knowledgeable terrorist like Mohammed or Abu Musab al-Zarqawi. But most of the inmates in military prisons are nothing of the kind. Commanders in Guantanamo acknowledge that hundreds of their prisoners pose no danger and have no useful information. How much of the hideous abuse reported to date involved men who were guilty only of being in the wrong place at the wrong time?

And fourth, because torture is a dangerously slippery slope. Electric shocks and beatings are justified if they can prevent, another 9/11? But what if the shocks and beating don't produce the needed information? Is it OK to break a finger? To cut off a hand? To save 3,000 lives, can a terrorist's eyes be gouged out? How about gouging out his son's eyes? Or raping his daughter in his presence? If that's what it will take to make him talk, to defuse the ticking bomb, isn't it worth it?

No. Torture is never worth it. Some things we don't do, not because they never work, not because they aren't "deserved," but because our very right to call ourselves decent human beings depends in part on our not doing them. Torture is in that category. We can win our war against the barbarians without becoming barbaric in the process.

RECOGNIZING ERIN ROBNETT, WINNER OF TEXAS VALUES VISUAL ARTS COMPETITION

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 2005

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Erin Robnett, an eighth grader at Crownover Middle School of Cornith, located in the 26th Congressional District of Texas, for being one of the three winners of the Texas Values Arts Competition.

This is truly an outstanding accomplishment for Erin. More than 250 students from Plano, Denton, Lewisville and surrounding communities entered the contest. Over Time is the name of Erin's piece which represents changes that have occurred during Texas' history. With Erin's win, she received a savings bond from Huffines Auto Dealerships.

Erin's piece had the pecan tree, mocking bird and the bluebonnet. It also features the Alamo and a soldier standing where the head piece would be. The head piece is half complete representing Texas' past and present.